

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 20 through 24, 29 through 32, and 42 through 52 are pending, with Claims 20, 29, 42, and 44 being independent. Claims 20, 24, 29, 30, 31, 42, 44, 46, 47, and 50 have been amended.

REQUEST FOR WITHDRAWAL OF FINALITY OF OFFICIAL ACTION

Applicant notes that the Official Action has Box 2a checked, indicating that the Official Action is final. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the finality, since Box 3(a) ("new issues") was checked in the November 16, 2005 Advisory Action, thereby precluding finality. MPEP 706.07(b), 706.07(c), 706.07(d). Favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

REQUEST FOR CONFIRMATION OF ENTRY OF SUBSTITUTE SPECIFICATION

Applicant again respectfully requests confirmation, in the next Official Communication from the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, that the substitute specification filed October 22, 2003 has been entered. Favorable consideration in this regard is earnestly solicited.

FURTHER REMARKS

Claims 20 through 24, 29 through 32, and 42 through 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over the article by Ioannidis, et al., IP-Based Protocols for Mobile Internetworking (1991) (Ioannidis, et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,371,852 (Attanasio, et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 20, 29, 42, and 44 variously recite, inter alia, that the source IP address and the destination IP address are the only IP addresses contained in the packet received from the TCP/IP stack or software, in combination with removing the ethernet header and adding another or a second IP header, with Claim 29 further reciting an application that generates an HTTP request, and with:

(a) Claim 20 further requiring that the driver and the TCP/IP stack are in the same device and the driver presents to the TCP/IP stack an ethernet interface;

(b) Claim 29 further requiring that the application, the TCP/IP stack, the driver, and the hardware interface are all in the same apparatus, and the driver presents to the TCP/IP stack an ethernet interface;

(c) Claim 42 further requiring that the driving means, the TCP/IP software, and a hardware interface between the driving means and a network are all included in the same personal computer, and the driving means presents to the TCP/IP software an ethernet interface; and

(d) Claim 44 further requiring that the receiving, removing, and adding steps are performed by the same personal computer that comprises the TCP/IP

software and the driver, and the driver presents to the TCP/IP software an ethernet interface.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Ioannidis, et al. nor Attanasio, et al., even in combination, assuming, arguendo, that the documents could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, inter alia, in Claims 20, 29, 42, and 44.

In this regard, Applicants note that Ioannidis, et al. shows that in the output routine of the IP layer, the IP datagram is encapsulated in an IP datagram of type IPPROTO_IPIP, and that the resulting IP datagram therefore has two IP source addresses and two IP destination addresses, which Applicant submits provides neither a description nor a suggestion of at least the above-discussed claimed features.

In more detail, the Official Action states at page 6, paragraph 12, that in Ioannidis, et al., the TCP/IP stack is in the mobile host (MH) and the output routine, which the Official Action implies is the driver, is in the MSS. This statement is respectfully traversed. Applicant respectfully submits that the Ioannidis, et al. output routine is not in the same device, apparatus, or personal computer as the TCP/IP stack or software as claimed, and does not constitute a driver or driving means presenting to the TCP/IP stack or software an ethernet interface as claimed, and therefore Ioannidis, et al. provides neither a description nor a suggestion of at least the above-discussed claimed features.

Meanwhile, Attanasio, et al. discloses, e.g., that a frame header is stripped from the front of the packet, which also provides neither a description or suggestion of at least the above-discussed claimed features.

With further regard to Claim 29, the Official Action makes reference to rlogin (port 513) and NFS (port 2049) from Attanasio, et al. which Applicant respectfully submits not to be the application that generates an HTTP request as claimed.

It is further respectfully submitted that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the above-discussed claimed features.

Applicant submits that by means of such features, for example, it is possible to use a driver or driving means of the present invention in combination with a standard TCP/IP stack, to achieve the result having the another or second IP header. Applicant submits that an advantage of being able to so use a standard TCP/IP stack is that an operating system typically does not allow modification to the IP network layer of the TCP/IP stack. Of course, the claims are not limited to the disclosed embodiments.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. For example, Claim 24 recites, inter alia, a web browser, which Applicant respectfully submits is neither disclosed nor suggested by Attanasio, et al. The Official Action makes reference to rlogin (port 513) and NFS (port 2049), which Applicant respectfully submits not to be a "web browser" as claimed.

Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW

If any questions remain, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's representative, Craig L. Plastrik, at (301) 601-7252 to schedule a personal interview. Favorable consideration in this regard is earnestly solicited.

REQUEST FOR ENTRY OF AMENDMENT

This Amendment After Final Rejection is an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, and is believed to clearly place this application in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that a full appreciation of these amendments will not require undue time or effort given the Examiner's familiarity with this application. Moreover, this Amendment was not earlier presented because Applicant earnestly believed that the prior Amendment placed the subject application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached at (301) 601-7252. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



5-15-2006

Craig L. Plastrik
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 41,254

HUGHES NETWORK SYSTEMS, LLC
Customer No. 29190

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States
Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop AF,
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

May 15, 2006

Ginger Fogle
Ginger Fogle

DSG/cmg

DC_MAIN 240128v1